



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/663,700	09/17/2003	Shinji Kimura	1288.43131X00	3969

7590                    09/08/2008  
MATTINGLY, STANGER & MALUR, P.C.  
1800 DIAGONAL ROAD  
SUITE 370  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER
----------

ELAND, SHAWN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2188

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

09/08/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b><i>Interview Summary</i></b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/663,700 <b>Examiner</b> SHAWN ELAND	KIMURA ET AL. <b>Art Unit</b> 2188

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) SHAWN ELAND. (3) Donna Mason.  
 (2) Sam Sough. (4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 03 September 2008.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference  
 c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.  
 If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Arimilli et al. (US PGPUB 2003/0009640).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Examiner and Applicant discussed the differences between Applicant's cache attribute management table and the prior art's page table entry (PTE) and discussed proposed changes made by client. Examiner and Applicant discussed modifying the claim language in order to avoid potential obvious-type rejections.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Shawn Eland/ Examiner, Art Unit 2188	/H. S. S./ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2188
--	--